

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 and 9-14 remain pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration. Claims 2 and 9 have been amended to remove the language "together at the same time" so that the examiner does not misinterpret these claims as requiring the scanners for both the first mode and the second mode from being driven together at the same time. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants submit that Arai would not have disclosed or taught driving the scanners for the first mode (e.g., full color image formation) while in the second mode (e.g., monochrome image formation) and switching to the first mode from the second mode, after the image formation in the second mode is completed, as set forth in independent claims 2 and 6. Arai also would not have taught the synchronizing feature set forth in dependent claims 6, 13, and 14. The secondary references, namely Gomi and Oda, would not have alleviated Arai's shortcomings noted above.

Applicants submit that claims 2-7 and 9-14 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

23 OCTOBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)